

# Committee 4 - Interpretations

Mike Sucik,  
State Soil Scientist, Iowa  
Chairman

# Charge 1-What new interpretations are needed?

- Jane Anklam surveyed users
  - suggestions about display of related resource data
    - should only point to related data
  - Suggestion to redesign interps for septics
    - are Soil Potentials a better approach?
    - Draft loading rate guide developed by Louis Boekman
    - a report in NASIS is similar

# Charge 1-What new interpretations are needed? (cont.)

- Some fixes are needed with existing interps
  - suitability as source of sand and gravel
- Users want data that they can use for applications
  - something similar to single phase SIR
  - Component data record report in NASIS is similar
- Want to know restrictive features rather than interpretive rating
  - use access template fed with data from NASIS report?

# Charge 1-What new interpretations are needed? (cont.)

- Requests for storm water infiltration in urbanizing areas
  - developed GIS application showing substratum permeability
  - infiltration influenced by other parameters also (e.g. structure)
- Discussion about description of bedrock
  - how do we describe what is actually on the ground

# Charge 1-What new interpretations are needed? (cont.)

- Use soil parameters for compaction susceptibility interp
- Other issues
  - Need to improve our index maps so users can find themselves
  - For charge 3
    - Need to document interpretations and logic behind them
    - Need to establish standards for documentation of NASIS interpretations

# Charge 2 - How should interpretations be presented

- Revamp properties table to meet customers' needs
- consider standards for export into other formats (including metadata)
  - let user select data to be extracted
  - we need to be able to service different levels of sophistication

# How should interpretations be presented (cont.)

- we need to consider other ways of viewing or displaying data including graphical display and animation

# Charge 3 - Interpretation standards

- We need to establish standards for documenting standards in NASIS
- We need to review our interpretive criteria to see if they are still valid
  - our criteria were established 25 years ago
  - we need to evaluate whether newer science or current performance data warrant changes in criteria



# Interpretation standards (cont.)

- We need a clearinghouse where sample interps are stored
- We need to document the logic behind interpretations being developed in NASIS
- Do we need a regional committee for interpretations
  - National or regional discipline workshops might be a better method for disseminating current technology

# Interpretation standards (cont.)

- We should consider support at a regional level for developing interpretations
  - groups of MO's might be best
- We need better communication about what interpretations have already been developed

# Interpretation standards (cont.)

- A national set of interpretations will likely be needed
  - we may not need as large a set as we currently have
  - national set should be based on which interps could be applied on a national scale
- Discussion about NASIS including both spatial and attribute data
  - should they be in different data sets?

# Charge 4 - Interpretations Object

- Should NASIS structure accommodate an interpretations object
  - current definitions and concepts of perfect joins are a problem the way NASIS data are currently structured
  - we need interpretations object or redefinition of perfect joins or both